



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

- b. Th. much as in the last but often granular. Dk. about .5-1. mm. broad, redish to dark brown; th. ex. rather thin, entire or crenulate. Sp. as in the last but $\frac{9-20}{7-11}$ mic. On bark, dead wood and rocks.

Lecanora subfusca.

- c. Th. areolate verruculose, pale-greenish, yellowish or whitish. Dk. about .2-.8 mm. broad, pale yellowish, buff or ochraceous-brown; th. rather thin, entire or crenulate. Sp. as in the last but $\frac{9-16}{4-7}$ mic. On bark, dead wood and rocks *Lecanora varia.*

THE END.

Cambridge, Mass.

SOME COMMON ERRORS.

EDWARD B. CHAMBERLAIN.

Several times during the past year I have noticed that some of the members of the Sullivant Moss Chapter were abusing the assistance given them by professional bryologists. Usually, the fault was in the misuse of the words "determined by," when sending out specimens offered through the BRYOLOGIST.

I have recently received from Chapter Members mosses which were labelled as named by this or that specialist, when the date of the collection and the often undried condition of the material made it impossible for the specialist to have seen either the specimen or even a duplicate of it. Further inquiry showed the facts to be somewhat as follows: A, collected a moss, and sent it to B, who determined it. Then A, wishing to offer it to the Chapter, and not having on hand a sufficient quantity, went to the spot where he previously found the moss, or where he now thinks he found it, secured more material which looked like the same thing, and distributed this last, labelling it "detr. B," *although B had actually seen none of the second collection.* This second collection may have been the same as the first, but it very probably was not. Under any circumstances it was very unjust and discourteous to the person naming the original collection to make him sponsor for the second. It is really a forgery of his determination.

To avoid such errors the following rule should be adhered to in the use of the words "determined by" or "verified by." Never under any circumstances mark a specimen as determined by another person than the collector unless that person has actually seen either the specimen itself or a true duplicate of it. In the latter case it is very much better to use the words "duplicate determined by." In such a case as that outlined above, the specimens must be marked as determined by the collector, for nobody else had anything to with them.

In this connection it may be well to explain what a duplicate is. By duplicates in mosses are meant, strictly speaking, specimens of the same species, collected in the same locality, upon the same substratum, by the same person and on the same date. The strictness with which this is to be interpreted depends to some extent upon the species of moss in question. In the case of such genera as *Ulot*a or *Grimmia*, or of certain of the

Hypnaceae, where several species may be mingled in the same tuft, by far greater care is to be used than in the case of say *Mnium hornum*, which is usually found in pure tufts.

Under all circumstances, the members of the Sullivant Moss Chapter should take especial pains in the matter of the specimens offered by them for distribution. First, be sure the specimens sent out are real duplicates, not a lumping of two or three different collections which you "guess" are the same. Secondly, when having specimens determined by another, send large quantities; if you are not familiar with the species send *all* the material you propose to use in the distribution. Thirdly, be scrupulously exact in citing the authority for the determination; don't endanger another's reputation by your own carelessness.

Washington, D. C.

ENCALYPTA PROCERA BRUCH.

E. J. HILL.

The finding of a sterile *Encalypta* on rocks at Lockport, Ill., in 1904, led to a correspondence with Mrs. E. G. Britton regarding its specific character. In 1889 I had collected *E. procera* in fruit on Presque Isle, Marquette, Mich. The question arose whether this might not be *E. streptocarpa* Hedw. (*E. contorta* (Wulf.) Lindb. as now called from an older specific name), or some other member of the genus. The specimens from Presque Isle consisted of one fruiting and a few sterile stems found in a tuft of *Distichium capillaceum*. The peristome of the capsule was unfortunately injured while examining it, but enough remained combined with other characters to lead to its identification as stated. A recent comparison with the barren stems of *E. procera* from British Columbia and fruiting plants of *E. contorta* from two stations in Europe sent by Mrs. Britton, which have a different capsule, strengthened this conclusion. A further search led to the detection of antheridia on the stem of the fruiting specimen showing that it is monoeocious as is the case with *E. procera*. The *Distichium* with which it grew was abundantly fruiting, some barren stems of *Myurella Caryana* were also in the tuft.

The specimens from Lockport being sterile, the vegetative character can only be used to determine the species. Comparing the leaves the same type is seen in the plants from the three American localities. The leaf of *E. contorta* is longer and relatively narrower than in *E. procera* which is broader towards the top, more decidedly lingulate, sometimes subspatulate. The costa of the latter usually ceases further from the apex. The cells of the basal hyaline part are larger especially near the costa than those of *E. contorta* and at times approach a square form. The leaf characters of the two are well shown in the figure in Roth's *Europäischen Laubmoose* Taf. XLI. From the evidence the specimens best agree with *E. procera*.

The stems of these mosses are well provided with propagula. It was noticed at the time of identifying the plants from Presque Isle, and a reference in a note under *E. procera* in Schimper's *Syn. Mus. Eur.* states that